

FORT WAYNE SENATE AGENDA
MONDAY
February 10, 2020
12:00 P.M., KT G46

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of January 13 and 27
3. Acceptance of the agenda – J. Toole
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. IFC Representative – J. Nowak
 - b. Deputy Presiding Officer – J. Toole
5. Report of the Presiding Officer – A. Nasr
6. Special business of the day
 - a. Purdue West Lafayette Senate Update – C. Erickson
7. Unfinished business
 - a. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 19-13) – K. Dehr
8. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. University Resources Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 19-16) – G. Schmidt
 - b. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 19-18) – J. Toole
 - c. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 19-17) – J. Toole
 - d. Executive Committee (Senate Document SD 19-19) – J. Toole
9. Question time
10. New business
11. Committee reports “for information only”
12. The general good and welfare of the University
13. Adjournment*

*The meeting will adjourn or recess by 1:15 p.m.

Approving
A. Marshall
A. Nasr
J. Nowak
M. Ridgeway
J. Toole
N. Younis

Opposed

Non-Voting
C. Ortsey

Absent

Attachments:

- “Procedures of Promotion for Lecturers at PFW” (SD 19-13)
- “Approval of Adding Member to the University Resources Policy Committee” (SD 19-16)
- “Approval of Adding Member to the Executive Committee” (SD 19-18)
- “Amendment to the Bylaws on Lecturer Voting Privileges (SD 19-17)
- “Constitutional Amendment – Apportionment” (SD 19-19)

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Talia Bugel, Chair
Faculty Affairs Committee

DATE: November 8, 2019

SUBJ: Procedures of promotion for Lecturers at PFW

WHEREAS, the Fort Wayne Senate approved guiding principles and procedures for tenure-track faculty at IPFW in the spring of 2015; and

WHEREAS, the Fort Wayne Senate determined that it was prudent to draft separate guiding principles and procedure documents for promotion of Lecturers;

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Fort Wayne Senate adopt SD 19-XX as the procedures for promotion of Lecturers at PFW.

Approved	Opposed	Abstention	Absent	Non-Voting
Talia Bugel Karol Dehr Hui Di Andres Montenegro Joseph Khamalah Dong Chen				Marcia Dixson

PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION OF LECTURERS

(Based on SD 14-36)

Purdue Fort Wayne and its autonomous academic units shall establish, within the timeframes and by means of guiding principles and criteria established in other documents, procedures for the evaluation of Lecturers for promotion according to the following procedures. Autonomous academic units shall consist of those units subject to the powers of the Faculty detailed in Section VI of the Constitution of the Faculty; other units may, at their option, adhere to these guidelines and procedures.

The procedures for evaluating Lecturers for promotion ensure fair and consistent treatment of candidates. The procedures include multiple levels of review with clear expectations for each level. When considered in its entirety, the procedures create a coherent whole that includes a system of checks and balances. While there are variations between academic units, all procedures are based on these principles. If a department/program (department) or college/school/division (college) cannot comply with specific procedures in this document, they are expected to explain why they cannot and utilize a procedure that conforms as closely as possible to the procedures in this document. The explanation and amended procedure shall be included in a separate document with recommendations regarding cases for promotion.

The procedures and guiding principles for evaluating Lecturers for promotion are discussed in separate documents (see SD 19-XX for guiding principles for Lecturers), but the two are interrelated. The procedures for evaluating Lecturers are the method for implementing the guiding principles.

Amendments to this document shall trigger reviews of college and department procedure documents. It shall be the responsibility of the Presiding Officer of the Senate, in concert with the Senate Secretary, to notify colleges and departments of any amendments to this document and the need to review their procedure documents.

The appointment letter of a Lecturer to more than one academic unit shall identify that department whose promotion process shall apply to the appointee.

1. Document Review and Approval

1.1. Department documents

- 1.1.1. Departments must include procedures and criteria for promotion of Lecturers.
- 1.1.2. Department procedures must adhere to the guidelines and procedures laid out in college and Senate documents.
- 1.1.3. Department criteria must align with college guiding principles, if such exist.
- 1.1.4. Department procedures must be submitted to the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee for feedback and then reviewed and approved at the college level. The feedback from the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee shall be forwarded to the college.
- 1.1.5. Department criteria must include:
 - 1.1.5.1. Criteria for quality of performance in teaching for promotion to Senior Lecturer.
 - 1.1.5.2. Rationale of the department for the criteria.

- 1.1.6. Department criteria must be reviewed and approved at the college level. The review by the college must focus on:
 - 1.1.6.1. The completeness and clarity of the department criteria document.
 - 1.1.6.2. The alignment of department criteria with Senate and (if such exist) college guiding principles.
 - 1.1.6.3. Compliance with Purdue procedural document Operating Procedures for Lecturer Appointments
- 1.1.7. If a college rejects the criteria of a department, a thorough explanation of the rejection must be sent to the department.
- 1.1.8. If there is a disagreement between a department and college about criteria, the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee will arbitrate the disagreement.
- 1.1.9. Upon passage of this document by the Senate, departments with Lecturers have one calendar year to draft, approve, and seek review of department Lecturer promotion documents.
- 1.2. College documents
 - 1.2.1. Colleges must include procedures and guiding principles in documents. Colleges may choose to elect the campus Lecturer guiding principles as the guiding principles of the college.
 - 1.2.2. College procedures must adhere to the guidelines and procedures laid out in senate documents.
 - 1.2.3. College procedures and guiding principles must be reviewed and approved at the campus level first by the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee and then by the Senate.
2. Decision Levels: Nominations for promotion to Senior Lecturer shall be considered at several levels. The quality of the evidence presented in the case is best evaluated at the department level. Candidates may respond in writing to recommendations at all levels. Written responses must be submitted within 7 calendar days of the date of the recommendation and proceed with the case. Cases for promotion to Senior Lecturer will be submitted on the same time schedule as tenure and promotion cases.
 - 2.1. The department committee
 - 2.1.1. Establishing the department committee: The department committee composition and functions shall be established according to a procedure adopted by the faculty of the department and approved by the faculty of the college in compliance with Operating Procedures for Lecturer Appointments. The Senate shall have the right of review of this procedure. The department committee shall follow procedures established by the faculty of the college or, in the absence of such procedures, by the Senate.
 - 2.1.2. Composition of the department committee:
 - 2.1.2.1. A faculty member deemed the equivalent of a department's "head for teaching and learning"¹(i.e., chair of curriculum or faculty affairs committee, a faculty member recognized for teaching excellence), one or more faculty with teaching responsibilities in the same general area as the Lecturer, and one or more Senior Lecturers (if not available from within the department, recruited from another unit).
 - 2.1.2.2. If, by established departmental criteria, fewer than three persons are eligible to serve on the department committee, the department shall submit to the chief academic officer of the college the names of faculty members from other departments whom it deems suitable to serve on the department

committee. From this list, the chief academic officer of the college shall appoint enough faculty members to bring the committee membership to between three and five.

- 2.1.2.3. Members of the department committee shall elect a chair from among its members.
- 2.1.2.4. The chief academic officer of the department may not serve on the department committee or participate in meetings.
- 2.1.3. Primary Tasks: The department committee shall review the evidence presented in the case, compare the case to department criteria, and make a recommendation to the next level in the form of a letter.
- 2.1.4. Letter of Recommendation: The letter of recommendation from the department committee shall be based on the case and department criteria and clearly state and explain the recommendation of the committee including commenting on the candidate's professional standing.
- 2.1.5. Other:
 - 2.1.5.1. Any faculty member, Lecturer and Senior Lecturer subject to the procedures and guiding principles of promotion to Senior Lecturer or promotion/ tenure at PFW shall have the opportunity to read and provide feedback on cases in their home department until the department committee has made a recommendation regarding promotion. Any document that is provided does not become part of the case and does not move forward with the case.

2.2. The chief academic officer of the department

- 2.2.1. Primary Tasks: The chief academic officer of the department shall:
 - 2.2.1.1. Review the case and compare the case to department criteria.
 - 2.2.1.2. Review how well the process has adhered to the documented procedures to this point.
 - 2.2.1.3. Review the recommendation of the lower level.
 - 2.2.1.4. Make a recommendation to the next level in the form of a letter.
- 2.2.2. Letter of Recommendation: The letter of recommendation from the chief academic officer of the department shall be based on the chief academic officer's review of the case in light of department criteria, the process to this point, and clearly state and explain the recommendation of the chief academic officer including an explanation of agreement or disagreement with the decision of the lower level.

2.3. The college committee

- 2.3.1. Establishing the college committee: The college committee composition and functions shall be established by the college faculty and Lecturers, incorporated into the documents which define the procedures of faculty governance within the college, and approved by the Senate. This procedure shall be periodically published, simultaneously with the Bylaws of the Senate, as and when the Bylaws of the Senate are distributed.
- 2.3.2. Composition of the college committee
 - 2.3.2.1. Members of the college committee must have prior experience serving at a lower level in the process before serving on the college committee.
 - 2.3.2.2. The college committee will include at least one Senior Lecturer. If the college does not currently have Senior Lecturers, one or more may be invited from other colleges to serve this role.

- 2.3.2.3. Members of the college committee may not serve consecutive terms. Terms shall be staggered and may not be longer than three years.
 - 2.3.2.4. Members of the college committee shall elect a chair from among its members.
 - 2.3.2.5. The chief academic officer of the college may not serve on the college committee or participate in the meetings.
 - 2.3.3. Primary Tasks: The college committee shall:
 - 2.3.3.1. Review how well the process has adhered to the documented procedures to this point and ensure that the candidate has been afforded basic fairness and due process.
 - 2.3.3.2. Review the recommendation of the lower levels.
 - 2.3.3.2.1. This review shall include a consideration of the basis of the decisions from the lower levels.
 - 2.3.3.2.2. If the committee judges that a decision from a lower level is contrary to the evidence, the committee may include consideration of the evidence in the case as it compares to department criteria.
 - 2.3.3.3. Make a recommendation to the next level in the form of a letter.
 - 2.3.4. Letter of Recommendation: The letter of recommendation from the college committee shall be based on the committee's review of the process to this point, and must clearly state and explain the recommendation of the committee including an explanation of agreement or disagreement with the decisions of lower levels.
- 2.4. The chief academic officer of the college
- 2.4.1. Primary Tasks: The chief academic officer of the college shall:
 - 2.4.1.1. Review how well the process has adhered to the documented procedures to this point.
 - 2.4.1.2. Review the recommendations of the lower levels. This review:
 - 2.4.1.2.1. Shall include a consideration of the basis of the decisions from the lower levels.
 - 2.4.1.2.2. May include consideration of the evidence in the case as it compares to department criteria if a decision from a lower level is judged to be contrary to the evidence.
 - 2.4.1.3. Make a recommendation to the chief academic officer of PFW in the form of a letter.
 - 2.4.2. Letter of Recommendation: The letter of recommendation from the chief academic officer of the college shall be based on the chief academic officer's review of the process to this point, and must clearly state and explain the recommendation of the chief academic officer including an explanation of agreement or disagreement with the decisions of lower levels.
- 2.5. The Senate Lecturer Promotion Committee (a.k.a. the campus committee)
- 2.5.1. Establishing the campus committee - this committee should be established each year in case it is needed based on 3.7 below
 - 2.5.1.1. Members of this committee shall be selected to staggered, three-year terms, by the Chief Administrative Officer of PFW and the two Speakers of the Faculty.

- 2.5.1.2. The committee members will be selected from a panel of nominees composed of at least two representatives from the faculty of each college elected according to procedures adopted by the college faculty and incorporated into the documents which define the protocols of faculty governance within the college. If a college has more than three Senior Lecturers, then at least one representative from that college should be a Senior Lecturer. The vote totals from the elections shall be included with the panel of nominees.
- 2.5.2. Composition of the campus committee
 - 2.5.2.1. The campus committee shall consist of seven (7) members.
 - 2.5.2.2. A minimum of four (4) academic units must be represented on the campus committee and no more than three (3) members of the campus committee may be from one academic unit.
 - 2.5.2.3. At least two members of the committee should be Senior Lecturers when that is possible given the panel of nominees.
 - 2.5.2.4. Members of the campus committee may serve at the department level, but not at the college level in the promotion and process while serving on the campus committee.
 - 2.5.2.5. Members of the campus committee may not serve consecutive terms.
 - 2.5.2.6. Members of the campus committee shall elect a chair from among its members.
 - 2.5.2.7. The chief academic officer of PFW may not serve on the campus committee or participate in the meetings.
- 2.5.3. Primary Tasks: The campus committee shall:
 - 2.5.3.1. Review how well the process has adhered to the documented procedures to this point and ensure that the candidate has been afforded basic fairness and due process.
 - 2.5.3.2. Review the recommendations of the lower levels.
 - 2.5.3.2.1. This review shall include a consideration of the basis of the decisions from the lower levels.
 - 2.5.3.2.2. If the committee judges that a decision from a lower level is contrary to the evidence, the committee may include consideration of the evidence in the case as it compares to department criteria.
 - 2.5.3.3. Make a recommendation to the next level in the form of a letter.
 - 2.5.3.4. Letter of Recommendation: The letter of recommendation from the campus committee shall be based on the committee's review of the process to this point, and must clearly state and explain the recommendation of the committee including an explanation of agreement or disagreement with the decisions of lower levels.
- 2.6. The chief academic officer of PFW
 - 2.6.1. Primary Tasks: The chief academic officer of PFW shall:
 - 2.6.1.1. Recognize the credibility of the decisions of lower levels.
 - 2.6.1.2. Review split votes and/or inconsistencies in findings and recommendations at, and between, lower levels. When there is a split vote and/or inconsistency, the chief academic officer of PFW will focus the review on that part of the case dealing with the split vote and/or inconsistency.
 - 2.6.1.3. Review how well the process has adhered to the documented procedures.

- 2.6.1.4. Make a recommendation to the next level in the form of a letter.
- 2.6.2. Letter of Recommendation: The letter of recommendation from the chief academic officer of PFW shall be based on the chief academic officer's review of recommendations from lower levels, the process to this point, and must clearly explain the recommendation of the chief academic officer including an explanation of agreement or disagreement with the decisions of the lower level(s).
- 2.7. The chief administrative officer of PFW will make final determination of promotion to Senior Lecturer.
- 3. Case Process: Nominations for promotion shall be considered at several levels.
 - 3.1. The candidate must identify the criteria document that should be used to judge the case. The department criteria document used must have been in effect at some point during the five years preceding the submission of the case.
 - 3.2. All cases for promotion to Senior Lecturer shall pass sequentially through the decision levels above.
 - 3.3. No information, other than updates to items in the case, can be added to the case after the vote and recommendation from the department level. The intent is that each level will be reviewing the same case. Each decision level is responsible for determining if items submitted after a case has cleared the department committee should be included in the case or considered to be new evidence that should be excluded.
 - 3.4. Each decision level forwards only a letter of recommendation to the next level. Recommendations may not include attachments or supplemental information.
 - 3.5. When the vote is not unanimous, a written statement stipulating the majority opinion and the minority opinion must be included. The candidate may submit a written response to the statement to the administrator or the committee chair within 7 calendar days of the date of the recommendation and must proceed with the case. At the same time that the case is sent forward to the next level, the administrator or committee chair shall also ensure a copy of the recommendation and statements of reasons, and the candidate's response, if any, are sent to administrators and committee chairs at the lower level(s).
 - 3.6. The deliberations of committees at all levels shall be strictly confidential. Within the confidential discussions of the committees, each member's vote on a case shall be openly declared. No abstentions or proxies are allowed. Committee members must be present during deliberations in order to vote.
 - 3.7. If a chief academic officer at any level is not recommending for promotion, the input and vote of the promotion committee at the same level must be sought.
- 4. Individual Participation
 - 4.1. Only tenured faculty and Senior Lecturers may serve as voting members of promotion committees at any level.
 - 4.2. No person shall serve as a voting member of any committee during an academic year in which his or her nomination for promotion is under consideration, nor shall any individual make a recommendation on his or her own promotion nomination.
 - 4.3. Individuals may serve and vote at the department level and one other level (college or campus).
 - 4.4. Voting members of committees and chief academic officers shall recuse themselves from considering cases of candidates with whom they share significant credit for research or creative endeavor, team teaching, service projects or other work which is a

major part of the candidate's case or if they have other conflicts of interest. The committee will decide if committee members who collaborate with the candidate need to recuse themselves. The next highest administrator will decide if a chief academic officer who collaborated with the candidate needs to recuse her/himself.

- 4.5. Any committee member, at any level, who recuses her/himself shall leave the room during the discussion of that case.
- 4.6. Chief academic officers who have written a letter of recommendation as part of 2.2.2. will recuse themselves from discussion or vote on that candidate's case at a higher level.

REVIEW OF PROGRESS TOWARD PROMOTION

In compliance with Purdue's Operating Procedures for Lecturer Appointment, each Lecturer will be reviewed for promotion at least every five years.

This [bracketed] section was passed by the Senate on 9 December 2019.

[SPECIAL ABBREVIATED PROCEDURE FOR FIRST YEAR OF SENIOR LECTURER PROMOTION PROCESS

Given the timeline involved for department criteria and approval and subsequent approval at all levels of cases and the fact that we currently have no Senior Lecturers to fulfill the roles required by this process, the first year should include an abbreviated process for promotion to Senior Lecturer such that Lecturers who meet the following criteria may submit their cases for review by a department committee **by March 15, 2020**. The Department Committee will make a recommendation to the Chair who then recommends to the Dean and, subsequently, Vice-Chancellor for promotion of Lecturers who:

- Have been at PFW/IPFW for at least 7 consecutive years; and
- Have had positive reappointments for the past 5 years; and
- Have made a substantial positive contribution to the campus which must be supported via:
 - Demonstrated commitment to student success
 - Continued reflection upon and improvement of their teaching;And may also be supported via:
 - Administrative responsibilities
 - Course or curricular revisions
 - Mentoring others' teaching
 - Service and/or community engagement
 - Research/creative endeavor.

OR

- Meet approved department criteria]

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Gordon B. Schmidt, Chair of the University Resources Policy Committee

DATE: 1/24/20

SUBJ: Approval of adding member to the University Resources Policy Committee

WHEREAS, The Bylaws of the Senate provide (5.1.4.1.) that “Senate Committees shall have the power to fill committee vacancies for the remainder of an academic year, subject to Senate approval at its next regular meeting”; and

WHEREAS, There is a vacancy on the University Resources Policy Committee; and

WHEREAS, The University Resources Policy Committee voted by email on 1/24/20 to appoint Hank Strelve to fill the available vacancy for the 2019–2020 academic year;

BE IT RESOLVED, That the University Resources Policy Committee requests that the Senate approve this appointment.

Approved	Opposed	Abstention	Absent	Non-Voting
Gordon Schmidt				
Darin Kaiser				
Tanya Soule				
Lindsey Dutrieux				
Jane Leatherman				
Steven Hanke				
Marcia Dixson				

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Faculty Senate Executive Committee

DATE: 1/29/20

SUBJ: Approval of adding member to the Executive Committee

WHEREAS, The Bylaws of the Senate provide (5.1.4.1.) that “Senate Committees shall have the power to fill committee vacancies for the remainder of an academic year, subject to Senate approval at its next regular meeting”; and

WHEREAS, There is a vacancy on the Executive Committee; and

WHEREAS, The Executive Committee voted on 1/29/20 to appoint Hui Di to fill the available vacancy for the 2019–2020 academic year;

BE IT RESOLVED, That the Executive Committee requests that the Senate approve this appointment.

Approved	Opposed	Abstention	Absent	Non-Voting
Ann Marshall				Craig Ortsey
Assem Nasr				
Jeffrey Nowak				
Mark Ridgeway				
James Toole				
Nashwan Younis				

To: Fort Wayne Senate
From: Executive Committee
Date: January 29, 2020
Re: Amendment to the Bylaws on Lecturer Voting Privileges

WHEREAS, 2.8.3 of the Bylaws of the Senate prohibit continuing lecturers from voting “on issues regarding promotion and tenure in the Senate and/or in committee,” and;

WHEREAS, the Bylaws currently prohibit continuing lecturers from participating in the Senate and/or in committee while these bodies are considering a promotion process for continuing lecturers, and;

WHEREAS, 10.1 of the Bylaws of the Senate require a two-third majority of Senators present and voting at a regular meeting to amend the Bylaws,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Senate adopt the following amendment to the Bylaws.

Section 2.8.3, amended to read as follows:

The elected representative of the continuing lecturers shall be eligible to serve on all Senate committees and subcommittees, but may not vote on issues regarding promotion and tenure **for tenured or tenure-track faculty** in the Senate ~~and/or~~ **or** in committee.

Approved	Opposed	Abstention	Absent	Non-Voting
Ann Marshall				Craig Ortsey
Assem Nasr				
Jeffrey Nowak				
Mark Ridgeway				
James Toole				
Nashwan Younis				

To: Purdue University Fort Wayne Senate
From: PFW Senate Executive Committee
Re: Constitutional Amendment--Apportionment
Date: 29 January 2020

WHEREAS, all major units at Purdue University Fort Wayne should be afforded representation in the Senate, and;

WHEREAS, the authors of the Constitution of the Faculty of Purdue University Fort Wayne never countenanced a situation where a major unit would possess fewer than six Voting Faculty members, and;

WHEREAS, a major unit has, in fact, now dropped below that threshold;

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Senate vote to amend the language of Section VII.A.4 of the Constitution to read as the following.

4. ***Apportionment.*** Senate membership shall be apportioned among the major units according to the number of Voting Faculty comprising those units. One member shall be allocated to each unit for every six Voting Faculty in that unit; **all major units must be allotted at least one Senator.** The representative of the continuing lecturers does not count toward a major unit's apportionment.

Approved
Ann Marshall
Assem Nasr
Jeffrey Nowak
Mark Ridgeway
James Toole
Nashwan Younis

Opposed

Abstention

Absent

Non-Voting
Craig Ortsey